



T

N.

6th

"Fo

PUBLIC DEBATE

— ON THE —

Immortality of the Soul,

— BETWEEN —

T. H. DUNN, (CHRISTADELPHIAN,)

— AND —

N. WASHINGTON, M. D., (WESLEYAN METHODIST,)

HELD IN THE

VILLAGE OF WATERLOO, ONT.,

— ON THE —

6th, 7th, 8th, 9th and 10th of July, 1874,

“For what is a man profited if he shall gain the whole world and lose his own soul; or what shall a man give in exchange for his soul?”
—Matt. 16., 26.

1874:

PRINTED AT THE “CHRONICLE” OFFICE,
KING STREET, WATERLOO.

BT 743

D 85

1874

P***

PREFACE.

The following pages contain what is believed to be a fair and candid synopsis of the arguments used on both sides in the debate. The notes are necessarily brief, having been taken for publication in the columns of the local newspaper, but it is believed that their perusal will give a just idea of the arguments.

The discussion arose through the acceptance in a friendly spirit of a challenge given by the friends of Mr. Dunn, who consequently took the affirmative of the proposition. The proceedings of each evening were opened by Mr. Dunn, who spoke half an hour, followed by Dr. Washington for half an hour, when each speaker again occupied half an hour, which terminated the debate for the evening. No formal decision was given at the close by either Chairman or audience.

It is hoped that the perusal of these pages will exhibit to the reader in a clear light, the utter groundlessness of the materialistic theory of man's nature, its irreconcilability with science, scripture and common sense, and the reasonableness and agreement with Holy Writ of the grand old doctrine of the IMMORTALITY OF THE SOUL.

PUBLIC DEBATE

— ON THE —

IMMORTALITY of the SOUL.

PROPOSITION—"Man in his present state is entirely mortal, and falls by the power of death into a state of total unconsciousness till the resurrection."

AFFIRMATIVE, - - - - -

NEGATIVE, - - - - -

T. H. DUNN, Esq.

N. WASHINGTON, M.D.

FIRST NIGHT.

H. F. J. JACKSON, Esq., in the chair.

MR. DUNN, on rising, remarked that however strange it might be to many to hear the doctrine that man was immortal, which they had been taught from their youth to reverence, objected to and confuted, it was now his duty to show that the very opposite was the teaching of scripture. Without revelation man knows nothing of his future, but within the lids of the Bible there was not a passage which teaches the immortality of man, but he was constantly alluded to as *mortal*. He sketched the Mosaic account of creation. God created man out of dust, he was then inanimate; he breathed into his nostrils the breath of life, and man, not a part of him, but the *whole man* became a living soul. The soul then was not in man or a part of man but the whole man. God made the perpetuity of his existence dependent on obedience to law. When man broke the law he entered into a dying state: 930 years afterwards he died and turned to dust.

Physiology proves that thought depends on the functional perfection of the brain, and any derangement of mentality is the effect of the derangement of the brain. He cited the authority of a Professor in a Pennsylvania University to show that without the brain thought is impossible. Thought is really as natural a production of the brain as bile of the liver. The eye sees, the ear hears, the tongue tastes, the nerves feel, the brain thinks. Paul treats a living soul and a natural body as identical. Man's thoughts are said to perish when his body dies. "The dead praise not the Lord."

DR. WASHINGTON contended that his opponent's arguments from Scripture were based on confusion and misapplication of terms and those from nature on a misapprehension of well-known physiological facts. The eye does not see any more than the telescope sees, the ear does not hear, but the spirit of man behind all these does see, hear, feel and think. Scripture uses the same word with different significations, just as we do in everyday life. Because men are called *souls* in some passages, it does not follow that *soul* must always mean the whole man, but it is often applied properly to the thinking, rational part of man. It is a stupid blunder to suppose in the face of contradictory scriptures that the *living body* is the *whole man*. Paul says he knew a man whether *in* the body or *out* of the body he could not tell. 2 Cor. 12, 2, Paul was willing, 2 Cor. 5, 8, to be *absent* from the body and *present* with the Lord. There is, therefore, something which thinks and knows, which is the *ego*, the personal man, and which is either in or out of the body, therefore not the body, but separable from it. Death in

scripture does not mean death of the body. "She that liveth in pleasure is dead while she liveth." "The soul that sinneth, it shall die." "In the day thou eatest thereof, thou shalt surely die." Adam's death was immediate, it was a death of life in the soul.

Because life does sometimes mean *existence*, it does not follow that it means nothing else; in these passages *life* and *death* clearly refer not to *existence*, but to opposite *states* of a being which continues to *exist* in either case.

Instead of showing that thought is a natural secretion of the brain, physiology shows that "every part of the brain has been found to be destroyed in one instance or another, while yet the individuals have not been deprived of mind or even affected in their intellectual powers." (Haller and Morgagni.) Dr. Abercrombie gives a case of a lady who died suddenly a few hours after visiting some friends, while in apparently good health. Her brain, on dissection, appeared healthy externally, but when a thin section was cut away, a cavity was exposed through which a probe passed in every direction without resistance. The whole hemisphere was a great cyst full of soft pulsatious matter completely decomposed." It cannot therefore be maintained that the brain is necessary to consciousness or thought, however closely it may be connected with the manifestation of thought. We cannot see without the eye, neither can we without the optic nerve, but it is *we* that see behind both eye and nerve, and the same *ego* interior to the brain itself thinks and exists, a separate entity.

MR. DUNN, in reply, contended that his opponent's argument that something behind the organs of sense was the perceiving entity proved too much, for if it followed that man had a spirit the pismire must have one too, since it also saw, felt, &c. But he did not contend against the existence of spirits, the angels were spirit beings. He did contend that man had no separable spirit entity. God said to Hezekiah, "Set thy house in order, for thou shalt surely die, and not live"—Is. 38, 1. He did not say, "thy body shall die, and thou shalt go to glory," or "thy body shall turn to dust, and thy soul shall wing its way through all eternity," but *thou* shalt surely die and not live. If Hezekiah was going to heaven he would have been glad of it, but he knew better. He knew that *thou* meant himself, the whole man.

The Dr. contended for a separate spirit entity, an immortal spirit. There were a great many spirits mentioned in scripture, a foul spirit, a broken spirit, &c., there were 54 different spirits spoken of as being in man, which of them did his opponent intend to tak as the immortal spirit? The law was that that which sinned whether you call it man or soul, should die, yet his opponent would have it that Adam carried about with him for 930 years a dead spirit in a living body.

DR. WASHINGTON proved by reference to Greek dictionary that *pneuma* translated *spirit* had various meanings: 1st, primary meaning, air or breath, 2nd, human soul, 3rd, the rational soul or reasoning power, 4th, that which feels, thinks, wills or desires, 5th, the temper or disposition, 6th, the Holy Ghost, 7th, the Divine energy or influence, 8th, the mind produced in Christians, 9th, the living creature. *Psauche* also translated *spirit*, has similar renderings. Hence Mr. Dunn's witticisms about spirits fall pointless. Because the primary meaning of the word is air it does not follow that it can have no other. "The wind bloweth where it listeth—so is every one born of the *spirit*." Wind and spirit are both *pneuma* in original. Hence the opposite argument was founded on a mere confounding of diverse meaning of the same term. Zachariah referring to the creation 12 ch. 1, says the Lord formed the spirit of man which is in him." That spirit is translated "mind," Prov. 9, 11. "A fool uttereth all his mind," Ez. 11, 5, Ez. 22, 32, Dan. 5, 20. Also rendered "understanding." Hence the *mind* or *understanding* is the *spirit* which God formed in man at creation. He challenged his opponent to controvert this proof that the spirit is an entity in man. 1 Cor. 2, 11,— "What man knoweth the things of man, save the spirit of man which is in man." The spirit *knows* and the spirit is in man, same chapter, 10 v. The spirit teacheth all things. Hence to the spirit is attributed all our mental powers. As to the separability of the spirit or thinking entity from the body, he cited the case

of Moses, who died and was buried, and 1,400 years later three disciples *saw* him on the Mount of Transfiguration, and three Evangelists record the fact.

"Fear them not which kill the *body*, but are not able to kill the *soul*!"—Matt 10, 28. If body and soul are one and inseparable, how could one be killed and the other remain alive? If the soul is only the animal life, how is it that men cannot kill it? "For what is a man profited if he gain the whole world and lose his own soul?"—Matt. 16, 26. How is it that one soul is of more value than the whole world? "Then shall the body return to dust as it was, and the spirit to God who gave it"—Eccles. 12, 7. That is, the spirit does *not* return to dust but to God. Acts 7, 59. Stephen says, "Lord Jesus receive my spirit." But Jesus had gone to heaven before this, and Stephen expected to be with him. In that faith he died. Is his trust and hope vain, or was his vision a true one? He challenged his opponent to harmonize these things with his theory of the inherent mortality of the whole man.

SECOND NIGHT.

H. F. J. JACKSON, Esq., in the chair.

MR. DUNN took up some of the passages cited by his opponent on the previous evening. The expression "breath of lives" used in the Hebrew text, Gen. 2, 7, is also applied to beasts, therefore it could not refer to the soul in the orthodox sense. He objected to being classed with infidels such as Voltaire, as he might in like manner charge his opponent with the errors of Spiritualism. He (Dunn) admits existence of spirit in man, but denies its being an entity, man is a unit and dies as a whole. Souls and spirits fail before God. Job 7, 7, "Remember that my life is wind." Ps. 79, 39, "He remembered that we are but flesh, and wind that passeth away." Where did Job's *ego* wait till the Redeemer stands upon the earth? In the grave. The *ego* is a functional effect of the organization. The multitude of organs in the aggregate are the *ego*, no part of them. When any of them fails the *ego* sleeps in the dust till Jehovah wakes it.

Spirit from *spiro* means the life principle. As to "in the body" and "out of the body," Paul wanted both spirit, soul and body preserved. There were three heavens in succession, the Antediluvian, the Jewish and the Christian heaven or dispensation. This was the meaning of the three heavens in the figurative language of scripture.

When Jesus commended his spirit to the Father he wanted him to preserve his *life principle*.

On Matthew, 10, 28. That which is destructible is not immortal, therefore, if God could destroy the soul it is not immortal, that is, has not immortality inherent in its own nature.

DR. WASHINGTON said Dr. Clarke says that which distinguishes man from brute is that "breath of lives" is applied to man, and "breath of life," meaning animal life, is applied to brutes.

If man's soul is material, the danger of the assassin may reach it, but scripture speaks of the soul as something which man cannot kill, but which God may destroy, not kill or annihilate, in hell. This valuable thing is compared to the whole world, but if it were a mere functional effect, the comparison would be absurd. Paul knew a man but could not tell whether he was in the body or not. The body could not be the man. We desire to be *absent* from the body and present with the Lord." If we are *bodies*, how could we be absent from ourselves? Paul speaks of *two* men in *one* man, yet both only one man.

Angels are spirits, and Dunn says there are no other spirits. But the Sadducees are said to have denied angels or spirits, while the Pharisees confess *both*. Evidently there are spirits, separate entities that are not angels. Jesus said a "spirit hath not flesh and blood." The disciples believed in disembodied spirits, and instead of correcting their error, he points out the difference between *bodies*

and spirits. In answer to Elijah's prayer the child's soul came back and re-entered the body. Did it come from nonentity? The soul must have been absent, else it would have to be created, therefore a soul did exist separate from the body. And Paul takes part in a similar discussion to the present between the Pharisees and Sadducees, and avowed himself a Pharisee and a son of a Pharisee. If Paul were here to-night, could there be a doubt as to which side he would espouse?

Then Jesus, when appealed to to decide between the same two sects, showed the Sadducees by a convincing argument from Moses himself that they were wrong.

God is not the God of the dead but of the living. Were Abraham, Isaac and Jacob dead, or were they living? If they were nothing and nowhere, God is God of nothing, but still not God of the dead. But if they still lived in another state of existence, as this plainly implies, what becomes of the proposition that man falls into unconsciousness and non-existence at death? The proposition and the scripture evidently cannot both be true.

Mr. DUNN said soul or *psyche* is equivalent to the whole man, or the life, or is used with the reflexive pronoun. All flesh did not mean man when God threatened to destroy all flesh, it included man and beast.

Ps. 14th. Man's thoughts perish. The dead praise not the Lord. He demanded that these texts be met. As to the Sadducees, angels are spirits, and the other thing the Sadducees denied was the resurrection. Jesus never referred to a separate entity in man. Paul said that which is to be raised must first die. If so, then unless we die, we cannot be raised, but the orthodox do not expect death, they expect to live on continuously, how then do they hope for a resurrection?

In reference to "the God of the living," God speaks of things to come as though they were, as in case of his promises to Abraham, and as Abraham will live again, he speaks of him as living. He lives in the future.

We are absent from the body, we from *one* one body, or how many we's? Cited Parkhurst that *nephesh* does not necessarily mean a soul. Job wished he had died so as to be at rest. He speaks of sleeping in the dust, of being as though he had not been, having been carried to the grave. This must mean total unconsciousness, "being as though he had not been." Psalmist says like sheep we are laid in the grave. The soul is under sentence of death, and goes to dust. Sons of men are beasts, that which befalleth the one befalleth the other, as one dieth, so dieth the other. There is no thought nor work in the grave. The dead know not anything. The soul died and the dead know not anything, therefore man goes into a state of unconsciousness at death.

Lazarus, the whole being who was dead *came* forth, not an immortal soul coming down from heaven to reanimate him. All that are in the graves shall come forth, not from heaven or hell, but from the graves. But the common belief is that they will come from heaven and hell, which may be hymn-book theology, but is not in the Bible.

DR. WASHINGTON. In reply to the text, "The dead praise not the Lord," he would ask Mr. Dunn to read the rest of the text, and see whether the difficulty would not disappear. The Psalmist goes on to say, but "we will praise the Lord forevermore." But Mr. Dunn wanted to snatch a great link out of the endless chain of this evermore, in order to get thousands of years of unconsciousness or non-existence smuggled into it.

Mr. Dunn denies that a spirit exists as an entity in man, but scripture says, God formed the spirit in man. What is that but an entity? The Psalmist hopes to walk *through* the valley of death, and to be sustained in doing so. If he is unconscious, how is he to *walk* or to need sustenance. When the heart and flesh fail, God is to be his strength and portion forever. The soul is redeemed, the body *will* be after death. Man does pass off this temporal stage like the beast, and he may be laid in the grave. Personal pronouns are applied to the body, or to the soul, or to the whole man.

If the soul has been redeemed from the power of the grave, how can the grave have power over it? The thoughts of man perish frequently in this life,

but he does not thereby become unconscious, nor does it follow that he shall not think any new thoughts. Job wished to have been at rest. But the unconscious are non-existent, how could non-existence rest? Prisoners too rest together, and small and great are not there, they are nowhere, how could they rest together? but he says they will come up no more. Very well then there is no resurrection either. Such are the absurdities into which the inference of Mr. Dunn would lead.

Paul says if Christ be raised we are *not* perished, but Christ has been raised, therefore we cannot go into unconsciousness, which would be the same as perishing. It is the *body* that will be raised at the resurrection not the *soul*. Bodies of the saints rose, but we have no proof that the saints sleep. Christ, when he comes, will bring the saints with him. But he is to come with *all* his saints. So none of the saints are in unconsciousness.

When Jesus restored the centurion's daughter to life, it is said her spirit came again to her. If it were non-existent, how could it come again? Is not this a proof that the spirit existed separate from the body? Mr. Dunn said that which thou sowest is not quickened except it die, so the soul dies. Well, does the grain of wheat die? Does not the *germ* live till the new life is raised? Every farmer knows that, and the figure is an excellent illustration of the true doctrine of death and the resurrection. The life is not extinguished, it lives, so does the soul, like the life in the sown grain. It never dies, while the external body does. Since Mr. Dunn had brought up this beautiful figure, he now challenged him to harmonize the facts of the death of the body of the grain, the continued life of the germ and its renewal of life in its new state, with his theory of death as a blotting out of being. His opponent had not yet met a single passage of the many put before him, and he (Dr. W.) now insisted that the attempt should be made.

THIRD NIGHT.

H. F. J. JACKSON, Esq., in the chair.

MR. DUNN said his opponent had not touched any of his arguments yet. He recapitulated the proof so far advanced and said that none of them had yet been met. He, on the contrary, claimed to have met all the arguments opposed to the affirmative. The word soul or spirit did not include immortality in its meaning. It simply implied life or breath, nothing more, and it was unfair to argue immortality from the word itself. As to the child raised by Jesus, the spirit is breath, that was what returned.

The expression "spirit came again" is frequently used, where the persons were not dead at all; for example, in Josh. 5, 1; Judges, 15, 19; 1 Samuel, 30, 12; 1 Kings, 10, 5; cases where the spirit is said to have left individuals and was restored by food or water.

In reference to Jesus bringing saints with him, they will not be gathered to Jesus till he comes back. Saints are waiting for Jesus to come, not waiting to come with him. The rod which should comfort David in the valley of Death was Jesus. An immortal soul could not pass through death because it could not die. Adam was 930 years dying, and died at the end of that time. He challenged the production of the phrase spiritual death. It does not exist in the Bible. When did Eve get the spirit of life? The transfiguration was a trance, it was not a reality, but simply a vision as one of the Evangelists called it.

In reference to resurrection, the germ goes into the ground, and if the opposite reasoning that life implied immortality were correct, there must be thousands of immortal souls hovering over a wheat-field.

Paul, in Corinthians, is arguing with men who believed in future life, but denied the resurrection. My opponent ought to deny it too, to be consistent. If a man can bask in God's favor without the body, where is the use of a resurrection?

DR. WASHINGTON quoted from Roberts' Twelve Lectures to show the actual belief of Christadelphians respecting man's state after death. Roberts defines *life* as meaning existence, and as being the result of functional perfection of the bodily organs, and death is the opposite of life, and is the result of the cessation of these functions. At death man goes where he was before he was born, he becomes *non-existent*, as though he never had been. This view Roberts held in common with Voltaire, from whom, indeed, he had borrowed that and other articles of his creed.

The Hebrew word *nepheah*, previously referred to, means: 1st, breath, 2nd, intelligence, 3rd, rational soul. But the arguments of Mr. Dunn, are based on confusion of these meanings. Translations of scripture by methods adopted by Mr. Dunn, would make unmeaning nonsense.

The body can be killed, the soul cannot. Let him come to the point and tell what that soul is which cannot be killed by those who can kill the body. Text about the value of the soul must be met also. If bodily life is meant, the comparison with the whole world would be ridiculous. Moses was buried in the land of Moab, how did he appear to the Apostles if he was non-existent. Mr. Dunn says it was a vision. But his disciples saw it after they awoke out of sleep, if it was a vision they would have seen it while they slept. This fact was fatal to Mr. Dunn's labored but futile attempt to explain away so formidable a passage.

As to the resurrection, Paul argues that the resurrection depended on Christ's resurrection. But Dunn says whether Christ is risen or not, we perish anyway. But he has risen, and Paul says we are not perished. Why did not Christ correct his disciples in their errors about spirits, if they were wrong? The patriarchs, it seems, were blotted out of existence, but Christ taught his hearers that they were living, which is right?

MR. DUNN repudiated Voltaire as authority, and denied having so much as read even Roberts. Mr. Dunn did not agree with Voltaire. He believed in God and the Bible. He holds that spirit had many meanings.

He did not deny that man was rational. Man cannot destroy the life hid with God, God can kill that, but man can kill the body. The transfiguration was a vision like Nebuchadnezzar's vision of the image. It is not said that Moses' soul was there, or Elijah's. It is the resurrection of the dead that is the hope of the Christian. The sleepers and dead in Christ were to be rewarded by his coming. The natural man is first, afterwards the spiritual man, hence the first could not be part spirit, part matter. Man is wholly mortal, and mortal puts on immortality, but at the resurrection then shall death be swallowed up in victory. Then man sees Jehovah's glory. He went on to speak of the grandeur of Christ's reign upon the earth. Rev. 19, 15, proves that the time of the dead only comes after 7th angel sounds at judgment. "All that are in the graves are to come forth to judgment."

The Sadducees took only the Pentateuch. Hence Jesus proved the resurrection from Moses only. He did not prove that there was an immortal soul. God spoke of his purpose, when he called himself the God of Abraham, Isaac and Jacob. He was their God in reference to his purpose to raise them up at the last day. The intermediate state is a blank in Scripture, God will not bring the righteous and wicked to judgment from heaven and hell, but will wake them from sleep. David has not ascended into heaven. David has been a long time in the shadow of death, and is still not in heaven, but unconscious in the dust like his fathers.

DR. WASHINGTON said *pouche* is never applied to future life; the word is *zoe* in every instance. The life of the body, the animal life simply is *pouche* in the original, but that of the soul in reference to its future is always *zoe*, an entirely different word. The attempt to make a point by confounding two essentially different words and things evinced either gross ignorance or great presumption. This disposes of the attempted explanations.

The life of Jesus, he says, was committed to God's keeping; but by the hypothesis this life at death is *nothing*, hence he commends *nothing* to His keeping.

What did God breathe into man? if it had life before he breathed it in, the hypothesis is false; if it had not, the contact of two dead things produces life, which is an absurdity. He challenged his opponent to harmonize the illustration of Paul about the kernel of corn with his theory.

He also pointed out that the death spoken of by Ezekiel as the consequence of sin was conditional, and might be avoided by turning from sin! "Turn ye, turn ye, for why will ye die?" But if temporal death, as Mr. Dunn argues, is the punishment of sin, we know that all *must* die in this sense, and how can men be reasonably exhorted to turn, in order to escape it?

Then the believer *hath* everlasting life. How can *everlasting* life be extinguished and revived again, be blotted out and resumed? The hypothesis is inconceivable, when fairly looked into.

He showed that many of the passages Mr. Dunn had cited were garbled, or taken out of their proper connection. In many cases he had not read the whole sentence, because it would spoil his case. The passage in Ecclesiastes, for example, comparing the temporal fate of man and beast, was a great stronghold of materialism, but they did not admire the last clause which gave the distinction, "the spirit of man goeth upward." He cited at length the raising of Samuel, who was brought from the spirit world and conversed with Saul.

The separate existence of disembodied spirits, consequently the personal identity of the spirit without the body is amply proved by passages speaking of the spirits of just men made perfect, who are in the city of the living God. It would be a singular perfection they have attained, if they are blotted out of existence.

FOURTH NIGHT.

REV. F. W. TUEBK in the chair.

MR. DUNN said he denied that God put a soul into man. He challenged the production of scripture to show it. Dean Alford rendered soul *life* in the passage comparing its value to the whole world.

In the passage referring to Jesus walking on the water, the word given spirit should be *phantasm*, an illusion. As to "formeth the spirit of man," this refers to the new heart and the new spirit to be given to Israel when they are gathered into their own land. As to "souls under the altar," they were souls of flesh and blood which had been killed and were told to wait there.

2 Kings, 18.—Hezekiah was a good man and needed not to fear death on account of sin, as had been suggested. Hezekiah did not wish to die because those in the pit could not praise the Lord.

He wanted to hear the gentleman's position about the pre-existence of souls. That was an Egyptian idea. Did the gentleman mean to maintain it?

Was Solomon drunk when he penned one part of the Ecclesiastes, and sober when writing the latter. He only asked "who knows the spirit of man that goeth upward." He did not say that there was one. Samuel, it seems, came up, not came down. Saul did not ask God to send Samuel; he prayed to a witch, and if God sent him he broke his own law, which commanded that those who sought unto witches should be slain. The whole thing was explained by clairvoyance. As to heathen nations believing in immortality, he ridiculed the idea of going to the heathen for proof. Jesus brought life and immortality to light through the gospel. The world by wisdom knew not God. The Dr. adds to the Word by saying that Saul died a spiritual death and that Saul asked the Lord to send Samuel.

Those who believe will not perish, life and death depend on belief. Luke 18, 18.—"Eternal life is for the righteous only."

DR. WASHINGTON said Paul was willing to be absent from the body, but present with the Lord. Hence consciousness was possible without the body.

And he looked forward to the resurrection when he should be reunited to the body. Solomon had reasoned deeply with himself on the great problems of life and death, and good and evil, but at last he cleared up his doubts in his last remarks that when the "silver cord should be loosed, the body should return to dust and the spirit to God who gave it." Hence it was misusing Scripture to take his musings as doctrinal proof when his conclusion a little further on was exactly the reverse.

If soul must be held to mean life, what does David mean when he says the living shall praise the Lord for evermore. He that believeth hath everlasting life. How can it be everlasting if thousands of years are to come out of it?

God breathed something into man, that thing must therefore be separable from him. That it is so separable is the plain teaching of scripture, which always refer to man as continuing to exist after the body dies.

What prompted the heathens to believe in immortality, if there is not a principle, a longing for it implanted within them?

The case of the thief's prayer on the cross and the Saviour's answer—"To-day thou shalt be with me in Paradise," showed that the dead are conscious, and their reward is immediate, in part at least.

MR. DUNN said his opponent's gospel was that of witches. He ridiculed it as a creed of superstition and necromancy. The soul of Abel cried from under the ground or altar on which he was sacrificed. The souls under the altar *do live* in the future and will reign with Christ a thousand years. If the body here is the soul's house, then there is another house in the heavens, and there will be a third house at the resurrection. Dr. Washington says the soul that sinneth it *shall* die, and then that it shall not die. He quoted a number of passages where souls are said to be slain with the sword. This is the way souls died. Beasts' souls (Num. 31, 28) were slain.

Facts prove that mind depends on functional perfection of bodily organs. Now matter has more power than spirit. Pressure on brain causes cessation of thought, derangements of functions cause lunacy.

Paul *hoped* for eternal life, showing that he had not got it in fact, else he would not have hoped for it.

The wages of sin is death, the gift of God is eternal life, given at the last day, but not sooner. Eternal life is in the Son, he that hath the son hath eternal life, that is in reversion, or the promise of it.

It is claimed that Jesus and the thief went to Paradise up in heaven somewhere the same day. But the thief's prayer was that he should be *remembered* when He came to his kingdom, not *went* but *came*. When would that be? when he came into his kingdom and set up that kingdom on the earth. To this all who waited for his appearing looked, and for his coming they hoped.

DR. WASHINGTON. The Saviour's answer is the basis of our belief, not the thief's prayer. *To-day* shalt thou be with me in Paradise. The brain is the medium through which the mind works, and of course if the medium is deranged, the mind's working is interfered with.

He says the wages of sin is death. But there is no condemnation to them which are in Christ. Now if, as Mr. Dunn says, the death of the body is the wages of sin, then no Christian should die; but all die, therefore the death spoken of must mean something else.

(The following is the conclusion of the Dr.'s speech, verbatim.)

My opponent has undertaken to *prove* that man is unconscious between death and the resurrection. To do this he must reconcile the plain meaning of God's Word with his theory. He calls on me for proof. I need not prove anything. My duty is simply to point out the fallacies that underlie his attempts at proof. He says that man immediately after death, is *as though* he had not *been*, is where he was before *being born*, is therefore *non-existent*, is *nowhere* and is *nothing*. This is his theory, in plain language, not an inference from it. but his own statement.

Now will the audience hold firmly before their minds this proposition of the

non-entity, the nothingness of man, while we compare it with scripture. Luke 23, 46—"Father into thy hands I commend my spirit." For "spirit" my opponent reads "life-principle." We give him the benefit of that. The moment after death the life principle went where it was before his existence began, went to nothingness. The passage would then read: "Father, into thy hands I commend my NON-EXISTENCE, my NOTHING."

Could Jesus in this supreme moment of his life's work have uttered such unmeaning nonsense? I challenge my opponent to reconcile his theory fairly and squarely with this text, and I ask this audience to watch him squirm when he makes the attempt.

Keeping still before your minds this notion of the nothingness of the departed, listen once more to the testimony.

Luke 7, 56—"Her spirit came again and she arose." Where did the spirit come from? The life-principle was non-existent and nowhere, if it took nothing from nothing, nothing remained. That is good mathematics and good common sense. But perhaps he created a spirit for this purpose. If so, it was not *the same* spirit, therefore not her *spirit*. But the text says *HER* spirit. It also says came again, meaning that it was there before. But a new creation could not have been there before, therefore he did not create a new spirit. Did he re-create the old one? No, that is impossible. The old one was blotted out of existence, and without existence *personal identity* was lost, and could not be restored, for the simple reason that no two things can be one and the same thing. Therefore, if the spirit came again, it could not have been non-existent. The Evangelist says it did come again, and on this text alone, the unconsciousness or non-existence of the life-principle or spirit falls to the ground. I challenge a square attempt to meet this dilemma and again I ask the audience to watch my opponent as he tries to dodge it.

In Kings 17, 21, we have the raising of the widow's son in answer to the prayer of Elijah. The child was dead hence by the hypothesis, his spirit or soul or life principle was extinct, did not exist at all. But Elijah prays that it may "come into him again." Where from? It does not exist, and if the body is to be revived, a new creation, a new life, must be given to it. But we are not told that God made a soul and breathed it into that inanimate form, we are told that "*the soul of the child came into him again.*" The *soul of the child*—not a new *breathing of life*, but the same soul that had departed. It had not been extinguished or annihilated, else the expression "*came into him again*" would be meaningless. Can anything come back from annihilation? *Eec nihil, nihil fit*—out or NOTHING NOTHING COMES. Will my opponent find a way of making his non-existent life-principle come back into existence again. He must do it, or I put it to this audience that his proposition falls to the ground.

My opponent denies the possibility of thought without brain, the bodily organs, he says, must all be intact and in perfect working order that thought be evolved. Scripture says differently. Turn to Rev. 8, 9. When the fifth seal was opened, long before either resurrection or judgment, John says he "saw the souls under the altar of them that were slain for the Word of God and the testimony which they held. They cried for vengeance on them that dwell on the earth, and they were told to rest for a season while their fellow-servants should be killed as they were."

Now see how completely this upsets all his hypotheses.

1. This happened before the judgment or resurrection, for some of their fellow-servants were yet to be killed.

2. These souls were of them that were already slain, therefore this occurred between death and the resurrection.

3. My opponent says that between death and resurrection, the dead are as they were before being born, unconscious; non-existent, non-entities. John says, "they cried with a loud voice." What!—a parcel of non-entities—a sum of no-things crying with a loud voice! Why, this absurdity is getting monstrous. But further, they are advised to rest for a little season. Think of unconscious non-

entities resting or being told to *rest*, to be patient for a little while till the rest of their brethren had joined them in the shades of non-existence. Need I point out any further how the hypothesis of my opponent heaps one monstrous absurdity on another, till sober language fails to characterize its utter folly.

But further, 1 Peter, 3, 19, 20. "Christ preached to the spirits in prison, which were disobedient in the days of Noah." Will my opponent face the music and tell this audience how in accordance with his theory Christ preached to beings that had gone out of existence, that *were not*, over 2,000 years before. We would feel thankful for a clear exposition of this point.

Turn we now to a statement of Christ himself recorded in Luke 16, 19 to 31. The beggar died, and that was the last of him as a conscious being, according to my opponent. But Christ says "he"—the beggar, that is—was carried by angels into Abraham's bosom. What did they carry? Was it the body covered with sores? According to Dunn there was nothing else to carry, the conscious thing had been blotted out of existence, a lump of clay covered with horrid sores was left. Did they carry that? Does any sane man say they carried that into Abraham's bosom? They carried *him*, and whatever the *ego* of Lazarus was, that was what they took.

But the rich man also died, and to avoid all disputes about his body, we are told he was buried. He too became non-existent of course, and that ought to be the last of him till after the resurrection. But no—"in hell he lifted up his eyes." What! a non-entity lifted up his eyes, "being in torments," and yet unconscious of them, existence gone, the whole being blotted out, the rich man was where he had been before he was born, and yet he lifted up his eyes in torment!! "And he cried and said—are these the acts of the unconscious dead, "*crying and saying*," "*Father Abraham*." What a simpleton this rich man must have been. Did he not know that Father Abraham was not in being for the last 2,000 years, and yet he cried to him, but I suppose being a non-entity himself, the rich man could not be expected to know anything. We are told that the dead know not anything, and it seems this dead man did not know much of the gospel according to Dunn. "Have mercy on me," that is, let Abraham who is nothing have mercy on me who am nothing! "and send Lazarus," here comes the other *non-entity*. "I am tormented in this flame." Dunn wanted an instance of the conscious *ego*, the I, conscious after death and before resurrection. Is he satisfied with this specimen? Can non-existence be tormented? Can unconsciousness suffer pain?

But further on *memory* and *reason* are ascribed to this dead man, who had been buried. Son remember, and Lazarus is comforted. How is he comforted if he is unconscious or non-existent? Will Mr. Dunn explain? Will he be kind enough to show this audience how this conversation between a brace of non-entities is even conceivable, on his hypothesis?

"I have five brethren," here is the very personal identity of the rich man established. The *ego* is clear here, the same individual whose five brethren yet live in wickedness on earth is pleading that a messenger be sent to them from the dead. Why ask such a thing, if there were no consciousness in the dead? How should a messenger from unconsciousness reveal anything? If the intermediate state be a blank, the very request of the rich man is conceived in unutterable folly.

But Father Abraham does not tell him so, which he naturally would have done, if he had been a good Christadelphian, he pleaded that Moses and the prophets were sufficient, "if they hear not them, neither will they be persuaded though one rose from the dead."

And so I say, if the citations I have given from Moses and the prophets, from Christ and the Apostles, are not sufficient to overturn in the mind of every thinking person in this audience the notion of unconsciousness between death and the resurrection, "neither will they be persuaded though one rose from the dead." Now let my opponent come up to the work and square his doctrine with these passages if he dare.

FIFTH NIGHT.

H. F. J. JACKSON, Esq., in the chair.

MR. DUNN.—If the spirits return unto God, they return as they came from him, but not as entities. They were not entities before entering into man, neither are they when they go out. If Abraham's bosom represents the New Jerusalem, it is parabolical, and if a part of the narrative is parabolical, so is the whole. "Without a parable spake he not unto them." Jesus accused the Pharisees of of being in doctrine and practice an abomination to Jehovah. In parables, kingdoms and nations are represented by a man. See Daniel 2, 41. The rich man is the Judean kingdom. He traced the history of the Judean kingdom, from the departure from Egypt to the time of Christ, and showed from Ezekiel that the whole house of Israel is represented as dry bones, and therefore dead. The two nations are to be united under Christ when he comes again.

Matthew 23, 8. This threatening referred to parabolical rich man. His riches was the bread from heaven, the Word of God; this was the advantage the Jew had over the Greek. This rich man had the tenth of everything. The poor man was the Gentiles, the aliens; the rich man rejected Christ. Every Gentile has to die as he receives Christ. The poor man died first, because he received Christ first.

The rich man went into torment when Jerusalem was destroyed, and the people suffered greatly. When does a nation die? Poland is dead, has passed into the Hades of Russia, Austria and Prussia. The Gentiles were carried by apostles and messengers into Abraham's bosom, that is, when the Gospel was preached unto them.

DR. WASHINGTON did not think it worth while to follow his opponent through the history of the Jews. Whether the statement is a parable or not is a disputed point, but it makes no difference, either view is equally fatal to the opposite hypothesis. The rich man is said to have died, but the Jewish people is not dead, but merely in captivity. Our Saviour was speaking to men who believed in an intermediate state. He coincides precisely with their view, he tells them the poor man is carried where they believed he would go, into Paradise.

What an absurdity to conceive of an unconscious thing being in torment. The rich man in torment retains his personal identity. "Son remember," &c.

Why did the Saviour carry the main incidents of his statement beyond the grave, if the dead are unconscious? If Mr. Dunn is correct, Christ's own words, not only in this but many other passages, were directly confirmatory of a false and mischievous notion held by the people of his time, and understood by them, and by 99 per cent. of his followers ever since, to mean that the dead are conscious. Paul says, "For me to live is Christ, to die is gain," his desire was "to depart and be with Christ which was far better."

Reconcile unconsciousness with that. How could anything unconscious enjoy Christ in any sense? The supposition is ridiculous. "The time of my departure is at hand." He did not expect to depart into unconsciousness, but to Christ. "The spirits of just men made perfect," must have been entities, could anything be perfected by blotting it out of existence? Paul could not decide whether the man he knew was in the body or out of the body. Therefore a man could be either in or out of the body. Paradise is spoken of three times in the New Testament always as a place where people are conscious.

How can there be a resurrection from nothing. Nothing can be raised from nothing, and if new beings are created, then God will judge and crown with glory or blot again out of existence these new beings for the deeds and the crimes of annihilated beings. At death scripture says the body returns to dust and the spirit to God.

If man was made in the image of God and if God is a spirit, man must be a spirit. He referred to the widow of Zarephath's son. Moses died and was buried, but 1433 years afterward he appeared again. He challenged his opponent to harmonize that with his hypothesis.

MR. DUNN wanted to know how much more power it would take to recreate an intelligence than to create it the first time? God can preserve the identity and recreate it. He summed up the argument. Man is a unity not duplex. There is but one man, my opponent claims two men, a body man and a spirit. He had proved that man was mortal, not part mortal and part spiritual. He denied having said that man is nowhere. The spirit is not man's but God's. Job says, "I shall not be," my opponent says God cannot raise the dead. "The wicked shall not be." If the rational soul be immortal it could not become insane, the mind is therefore not immortal. The dead know not anything. The mind is subject to the laws of matter. The intermediate state is entirely ignored. All rewards are referred to the resurrection. The opposite doctrine punishes and rewards man before the Assize, according to Josephus, but not according to the scriptures. Eternal life is the gift of God. The gift does not belong to the old Adam.

Souls could be torn in pieces, eaten by lions, &c. If the intermediate state be a finality, how could Jesus speak to the spirits in prison? My opponent has not yet chosen which of the fifty-four spirits I gave him he will invest with immortality. I challenge him to make choice. Had cited numerous instances of spirit coming into persons after being refreshed with water, &c. He denied being a Materialist, believed that those who put on Christ will receive immortality when Christ returns to the earth. He then enlarged upon Christ's second coming, when he would reign as a personal monarch upon the earth, and expounded at some length the views of the Christadelphians upon this point.

DR. WASHINGTON disputed that *analuio* means to return, it means to depart or separate from. But on the hypothesis of the essential unity of man there is nothing to separate. Referred to Greek Lexicon for proof. If man is a unity and anything is superadded there is something more than unity. If there is no entity in man, how does the spirit know the things of man. In recapitulating, the Dr. referred to the following texts which he had adduced and applied during the discussion, most of which are noticed in our report. Gen. 1, 26, 27, Gen. 2, 7, "breath of *lives*" (Heb.) 1 Kings 17, 21, 22; 2 Kings, 2, 11; 1st Sam.

Deut. xxxiv, 5,—Death of Moses and his appearance on Mt. Tabor 1483 years after; Matt. xvii, 1 to 9 inclusive, also Mark ix, 1 to 8, Luke ix, 27, 38.

1 Samuel, xxviii, 15,—Bringing up Samuel after being dead 6 years, by the art of necromancy. Job xiv, 22, xix, 26, Psalms xxx, 3, 31, 3, 23, 4, lxxiii, 24, 25, f26, cxvii, 16, xlix, 8, 15. David on the loss of his child, 2 Samuel xii, 23. I will go to him but he will not return to me. Then the child must be somewhere, not annihilated. Prov. xii, 28, xvi, 18, xvi, 32, Eccles. viii, 8, iii, 21, xii, 7, Is. xii, 1,—"Formeth the spirit of man within him." Is. xiii, 5, Matt. x, 28, Luke xx, 29 to 58 inclusive, Abraham, Isaac and Jacob were dead, Abraham 330, Isaac 225, Jacob 198 years, still God was their God, as will be found in Exodus ii, 6, where God spoke to Moses out of the burning bush. Luke xvi, 19, to the end of the chapter. Luke xxiii, 43, xxiii, 46, viii, 54, 55—"And her spirit came again." Luke xxiv, 36, 39, Acts vii, 59, read the context. Dr. demanded that his opponent should illustrate his signification of death which is a state of total unconsciousness, with the following passages, 1 Cor. ii, 10, 11, John xii, 24, 2 Cor. iv, 16, ii, 1 to 9 inclusive, 2 Cor. xii, 1 to 4 inclusive, Phil. i, 21 to 25 inclusive, 2 Tim. iv, 6 to 8 inclusive, Heb. xi, 26, xii, 22, 23, James ii, 26, Peter i, 13, 14, 1 Peter, iii, 18, 19, 20, Jude 14, Rev. vi, 9, 10, 11, Rev. vii, 9 to 17, Rev. xiv, 13.

This closed the discussion. During the latter two evenings especially, the Dr. was repeatedly and enthusiastically applauded by the greater part of the audience, who seemed unable to restrain their satisfaction at the thorough and complete exposure with which he met the plausible sophistries of his adversary.

Votes of thanks to the speakers and Chairman were moved by members of the committee of management, who represented both sides in the discussion, and this closed the proceedings.

PRESENTATION.

Next evening a number of gentlemen of the Village of Waterloo invited Dr. Washington to meet them in the office of the Ontario Mutual Life Assurance Company. On his arrival, Jeremiah Hughes, Esq., was placed in the chair. Mr. Earle was appointed Secretary, and G. W. Bingham, Esq., M.D., being called upon, presented to Dr. Washington a handsome, gold-headed ebony walking-cane; as a memento of the discussion and a token of the high esteem felt for him by the people of the village. In his speech, Dr. Bingham referred to the generous spirit of self-sacrifice which had been evinced by the guest of the evening in leaving his home and practice to engage in this discussion, and trusted that it would be productive of lasting good in the community. Dr. Washington made a suitable and feeling reply; and short speeches were made by the Chairman and Rev. C. Cookman, W. M. Minister, the Editor of the *Chronicle*, and others. The following inscription appears on the head of the cane:

Presented to
N. WASHINGTON, M. D.,
BY HIS FRIENDS IN WATERLOO,
at the close of the debate on the
Immortality of the Soul.
July 11, 1874.

